

REC'D TH

Jim Lamoureux
Senior Attorney
Law and Government Affairs
Southern Region
jlamoureux@att.com

REGULATION AUTH.

1200 Peachtree Street N.E.

101 RPR Atlanta, GA 30309

404 810 4196

0 FFAX: 404(810 5901

EXECUTIVE SCORETARY

April 2, 2001

By Hand

David Waddell Executive Secretary Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, Tennessee 37243

Re: Petition for Arbitration of the Interconnection Agreement Between AT&T Communications of the South Central States, Inc., TCG MidSouth, Inc. and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.) Pursuant to the 47 U.S.C. § 252

Docket No. 00-00079

Dear Mr. Waddell:

Enclosed please find the original and thirteen (13) copies of Jay Bradbury's Supplemental Testimony in this proceeding. Mr. Bradbury's testimony references Exhibit JMB-S5, a red-lined copy of the Revised Change Control Process document. That document will be filed tomorrow as a Late-filed Exhibit.

If you have questions, please call me.

Sincerely,

Jim Lamoureux

Encls.

cc: Douglas Lackey

1		BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY			
2	SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF JAY M. BRADBURY				
3	ON BEHALF OF				
4		AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE SOUTHERN STATES, INC.			
5		AND TCG MIDSOUTH, INC.			
6		DOCKET NO. 00-00079			
7		APRIL 2, 2001			
8					
9					
10	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS.			
11	A.	My name is Jay M. Bradbury. My business address is 1200 Peachtree Street			
12		Suite 8100, Atlanta, Georgia 30309.			
13					
14	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR CURRENT POSITION AND			
15		RESPONSIBILITIES.			
16	A.	I am a District Manager in the AT&T Law and Government Affairs			
17		organization, and I provide consulting support to AT&T's business units and			
18		other internal organizations. In particular, I am involved in the negotiation			
19		and implementation of interfaces for operational support systems ("OSS")			
20		necessary to support AT&T's entry into the local telecommunications			
21		market.			
22					

	Q.	ARE YOU THE SAME JAY M. BRADBURY THAT FILED DIRECT
2		AND REBUTTAL TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE ON DECEMBER 20,
3		2000 AND JANUARY 8, 2001?
4	A.	Yes, I am.
5		
6	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
7	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to provide clarification as to the scope of my
8		testimony related to the Change Control Process (Issue 17) and update the
9		status of the sub-issues that remain open between the parties as requested by
10		the Authority.
11		
12	Q.	DID YOUR DIRECT AND REBUTTAL TESTIMONY INCLUDE
13		DISCUSSION OF A NUMBER OF SUB-ISSUES NOT CONTAINED IN
14		THE JOINT ISSUES MATRIX? FURTHER DID YOUR DIRECT
15		AND REBUTTAL TESTIMONY INCORRECTLY ASSOCIATE
16		CERTAIN SUB-ISSUES AND THEIR ALPHABETICAL
17		DESIGNATIONS?
18	A.	Yes.
19		
20	Q.	PLEASE PROVIDE THE AUTHORITY WITH THE PROPER
21		LISTING OF SUB-ISSUES CONTAINED WITHIN ISSUE 17.
22	A.	The correct listing of sub-issues is as follows:

1		Issue 17: Should the Change Control Process be sufficiently			
2		comprehensive to ensure that there are processes to handle at a minimum			
3		the following situations:			
4		a) introduction of new interfaces;			
5		b) retirement of existing interfaces;			
6		c) exceptions to the process;			
7		d) documentation, including training;			
8		e) defect correction;			
9		f) emergency changes (defect correction);			
10		g) an eight-step cycle, repeated monthly;			
11		h) a firm schedule for notifications associated with changes initiated			
12		by BellSouth;			
13		i) a process for dispute resolution including referral to state utility			
14		commissions or courts;			
15		j) a process for escalation of changes in process;			
16 17		k) a process for changing the process.			
18					
19	Q.	WHAT CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE TO YOUR DIRECT			
20		TESTIMONY TO CONFORM IT TO THIS LISTING?			
21	A.	The following table presents the changes that should be made to my direct			
22		testimony.			
23					

Page(s)	Line(s)	Action
53	12-21	Strike
54	3	Replace "in section o" with "in section k."
75 -77	p. 75 line 5 thru p. 77 line 21	Strike

4 Q. WHAT CHANGES SHOULD BE MADE TO YOUR REBUTTAL

5 TESTIMONY TO CONFORM IT TO THIS LISTING?

6 A. The following table presents the changes that should be made to my rebuttal

7 testimony.

Page(s)	Line(s)	Action		
18	6	Strike		
18	7	Replace "Testing Support and Testing" with "The Process of Changing the Process."		
18	8 thru 13	Strike		

1	Q.	THE AUTHORITY HAS REQUESTED THAT THE STATUS OF THIS
2		ISSUE AND ITS SUB-ISSUES BE UPDATED HAVE YOU PREPARED
3		AN UPDATE?
4	A.	Yes. Since the filing of my Rebuttal Testimony on January 8, 2001, the
5		Change Control Process Document has been revised twice. The current
6		Document is Version 2.2 and was published by posting to the BellSouth CCP
7		Web Site on March 26, 2001.
8		
9		The two revisions to the Document resulted from the implementation and use
10		of an e-mail balloting process subsequent to Change Control Process
11		Improvement Meetings held on January 10 and February 21, 2001. Ballot
12		No. 1 (Exhibit JMB-S1) contained 34 items all of which were approved by
13		the consensus of the CLECs (Exhibit JMB-S2). Despite the CLEC consensus
14		BellSouth exercised its veto power and did not incorporate seven changes
15		into Versions 2.1 and 2.1.A of the document published on February 9 and
16		February 16, 2001 ¹ . Ballot No. 2 (Exhibit JMB-S3) contained 29 items, 27 of
17		which were approved through the ballot process (Exhibit JMB-S4) and have
18		been incorporated into Version 2.2.
19		
20		These ballots and the subsequent publication of revisions to the CCP
21		Document have resolved a number of sub-issues in this arbitration.
22		

The seven items approved by the CLPs but vetoed by BellSouth are items 18, 21, 23, 28, 31, 33, and 34 listed and described in Attachment 1.

1	Q.	PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE STATUS OF THE SUB-ISSUES.
2	A.	The status of the sub-issues in this arbitration subsequent to the publication of
3		Version 2.2 of the CCP Document are as follows:
4		a) introduction of new interfaces; - RESOLVED
5		b) retirement of existing interfaces; - RESOLVED
6		c) exceptions to the process; - RESOLVED
7		d) documentation, including training; - RESOLVED
8		e) defect correction; - Definition – RESOLVED, Cycle Time - OPEN
9		f) emergency changes (defect correction); - RESOLVED
10		g) an eight-step cycle, repeated monthly; - Number of Steps –
11		RESOLVED, Cycle Time - OPEN
12		h) a firm schedule for notifications associated with changes initiated
13		by BellSouth; - OPEN
14		i) a process for dispute resolution including referral to state utility
15		commissions or courts; - OPEN
16		j) a process for escalation of changes in process; - RESOLVED
17 18		k) a process for changing the process RESOLVED
19		
20	Q.	WHERE SHOULD THE AUTHORITY NOW LOOK TO FIND
21		AT&T'S CURRENT REQUESTS CONCERNING THE REMAINING
22		OPEN ITEMS?
23	A.	Exhibit JMB-S5 is a copy of the current CCP Document Version 2.2 with
24		AT&T's requested changes provided in "revision marking" or "red line"
25		format. This single document provides the Authority with AT&T's requested

- changes in the context of the most current version of the CCP Document that
 is the foundation upon which the Authority should base its decision in this
 arbitration.
- 4
- 5 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY AT THIS TIME?
- 6 A. Yes.

CLEC Participant Company Name:	Date:
ITEM NO. 1 - Meeting Consensus Section 1 - Introduction - Page 7 (8 th bulleted item in last section) • Documentation (i.e., business rules for electronic and manual processes relative to order, pre-order, maintenance, including User Guides that support OSS systems currently within the scope of CCP.	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
 Section 1 - Introduction - Page 8 The first section bulleted items that are reflecting a change are: The scope of the Change Control Process does not include the following which are handled through existing BellSouth processes: Coordination of test agreements will continue to be supported by the Account Team Questions regarding existing documentation should be handled by the Account Team. However, if documentation needs to be changed for clarification purposes, a defect change request should be submitted through Change Control. 	☐ Agree ☐ Generally Agree ☐ Neutral ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Disagree
Section 3 - Introduction - Page 11 & 12 Type 2 - Regulatory Change Accept the additional language - "Type (2) changes may be managed using the Expedited Feature Process, as discussed in Section 4, Part 3. Type 3 - Industry Standard Change Accept the additional language - "Type (3) changes may be managed using the Expedited Feature Process, as discussed in Section 4, Part 3. Type 4 - BellSouth Initiated Change Accept the additional language - "Type (4) changes may be managed using the Expedited Feature Process, as discussed in Section 4, Part 3.	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
Type 5 – CLEC Initiated Change Accept the additional language – "Type (5) changes may be managed using the Expedited Feature Process, as discussed in Section 4, Part 3.	Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S1 Page 1 of 15

Section 3 - Introduction - Page 12 Type 6 - CLEC Impacting Defects - This section will now read: A Type 6 defect request is any non-type 1 change that corrects problems discovered in production versions of an application interface. These problems are where the interface is not working in accordance to the BellSouth baseline business requirements or the business rules that BellSouth has published or otherwise provided to the CLECs. In addition, if functional requirements agreed upon by BellSouth and the CLECs, results in inoperable functionality, even though software business requirements and business rules match; this will be addressed as a defect. These problems typically affect the CLEC's ability to exchange transactions with BellSouth and may include documentation that is in error, has missing information or is unclear in nature. Type 6 validated defects may not be managed using the Expedited Feature Process as discussed in Section 4, Part 3.	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
The CLEC and/or BellSouth may initiate defect changes affecting interfaces between the CLEC's and BellSouth's operational support systems. These type changes might also include issues for Pre-Orders, Orders, Queries, and Maintenance Requests that can be submitted and accepted, but may require workarounds or clarification.	
TEM NO. 5 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
Section 4 - Part 1 - Type 1 Detail Process Flow - Page 18 step 1 - Activity #4 will be reflected as: 4. ECS will provide the CLEC with a trouble ticket number, if requested, to record and track the outage.	Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
TEM NO. 6 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
tep 2 – Activity #1 will be reflected as:	Generally Agree Neutral
1. ECS will post to the Web an Initial Industry Notification that a BellSouth Electronic Interface outage has been identified. An e- mail to the CLECs participating in Change Control will be	Somewhat Disagree Disagree
distributed. The system ticket number of the outage will be included in the web posting and the e-mail notification.	Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S1 Page 2 of 15
Issued: 3/20/2001	D. C.F.

ITEM NO. 7 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
Section 4 - Part 2 - Types 2-5 Process Flow - Page 26 Step 4 - Activity #5 will be reflected as:	Generally Agree Neutral
5. Provide size and scope information on each pending change request to CLECs.	Somewhat Disagree Disagree
Also, add the following bullet under OUTPUTS : • Size and scope on each Pending change request.	
ITEM NO. 8 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
Section 4 – Part 3 – Types 2-5 Exception/Expedited Feature	Generally Agree
Process - Pages 33-37 WITHDRAWAL	Neutral
This CLEC Part 3 – Types 2-5 Exception/Expedited Feature Process was withdrawn in favor of the BellSouth offered Part 3 with modifications.	Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 9 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
Section 4 – Part 3 – Types 2-5 Exception/Expedited Feature	Generally Agree
Process SPLIT FROM "DEFECT PROCESS" INTO SEPARATE	Neutral
SECTION FOR EXPEDITED FEATURES ONLY.	Somewhat Disagree
Note: Exception "Language" removed from Expedited Feature Process.	Disagree
ITEM NO. 10 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
Section 4 – Part 3 – Expedited Feature Process -Page 37 Title Page and definitions will read as follows:	Generally Agree Neutral
An Expedited Feature is the inability for a CLEC to process certain types	Somewhat Disagree
of LSR's based on the existing functionality to BellSouth's Operations Support Systems (OSSs) that are in the scope of CCP. The change request	Disagree
for an expedite must provide details of the business impact and will fall into one of two categories:	
 A defect that has been re-classified as a feature where the 	
CLEC/BellSouth has determined should be expedited due to impact	
An enhancement to an existing product or service where the CLEC/BellSouth has determined should be expedited due to impact.	
impact	Docket No. 00-00079
Re-classified Defects	JMB-S1
When a defect is re-classified as a feature, the CLEC/BellSouth will be	Page 3 of 15
notified by Change Control in the standard defect validation. The CLEC	1

will have the shility to sel. Dell's will to the light of	
will have the ability to ask BellSouth to expedite the reclassified feature by updating the change request, marking it as an expedite and sending back to Change Control. The change request will then follow through the Types 2-5 Expedited Feature process using agreed upon intervals.	
Enhancements to an existing product or service	
A CLEC/BellSouth will also have the ability to submit a Type 2-5 change request as an expedited feature request for an enhancement to an existing product or service where the functionality does not currently exist in BellSouth's offered products and services.	
 For both re-classifed defects and enhancements to an existing product or service, the rules surrounding the expedited feature request will be: Must be an enhancement to an existing product or service Will follow the Expedited Feature process flow described below which is based on the current Types 2-5 process flow using agreed upon intervals with the exception of Steps 4-6 that are eliminated. The CLEC/BellSouth will be required to give impacts and the consequences for not implementing the feature in the current, next, or point release, best effort. 	
ITEM NO. 11 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Part 3 - Expedited Feature Process -Page 39 Table 4-3. Types 2-5 Expedited Feature Detail Process Flow - STEP 1 Accountability - CCCM & BCCM Sub-process - Activity	☐ Agree☐ Generally Agree☐ Neutral☐ Somewhat Disagree
IDENTIFY NEED	Disagree
 Internally determine need for change request. These change requests might involve system enhancements, manual and/or business process changes. Originator and CCCM or BCCM should complete the standardized Change Request Form according to Checklist. Attach related requirements and Attachment A-1A, Item 22. Appropriate CCCM/BCCM submits Change Request Form and related information via e-mail to BellSouth. Inputs and Outputs: Change Request Form (Attachment A-1) Change Request Form Checklist (Attachment A-1A) 	
• Completed Change Request Form with related documentation	Docket No. 00 00070
2 , sand a s	Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S1 Page 4 of 15

	-	
ITEM NO. 12 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Part 3 - Expedited Feature Process -Page 39 Table 4-3. Types 2-5 Expedited Feature Detail Process Flow - STEP 2 Accountability - BCCM Sub-process - Activity OPEN CHANGE REQUEST/VALIDATE CHANGE REQUEST FOR COMPLETENESS 1. Log Request in Change Request Log. 2. Send Acknowledgment Notification (Attachment A-3) via e-mail to originator. 3. Establish request status ('N' for New Request) 4. Review change request for mandatory fields using the Change Request Form Checklist. 5. Verify Change Request specifications and related information exists. 6. Send Clarification Notification via email to the originator (Attachment A-4) if needed. 7. Update Change Request Status to "PC" for Pending Clarification if clarification is needed. CLEC or BellSouth Originator If clarification is needed, make necessary corrections per Clarification Notification and submit Change Request Clarification Response (Attachment A-2).	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree	
Inputs and Outputs: INPUTS: Completed Change Request Form with related documentation Change Request Form Checklist Change Request Clarification Response OUTPUTS: New Change Request Acknowledgment Notification Validated Change Request Clarification Notification Industry Notification via e-mail and web posting Cycle Time: 1 Bus Day - Clarification times would be in addition to cycle time.	Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S1 Page 5 of 15	

Issued: 3/20/2001 PAGE 5

ITEM NO. 13 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Part 3 - Expedited Feature Process -Page 41 Table 4-3. Types 2-5 Expedited Feature Detail Process Flow - STEP 5 Accountability - BCCM, Project Managers from each participating company. Sub-process - Activity RELEASE MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION (Meeting consensus was reached on the following bullet only) 2. BellSouth User Requirements for software changes will be presented to CLECs, if applicable. If needed, changes will be incorporated and requirements re-baselined. OUTPUTS (Add the following bullet) • Documentation Changes	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 14 - Meeting Consensus Section 5 - Part 3 - Defect Process -Pages 42 - 50 Strike all references to EMERGENCY CHANGE and EXPEDITE throughout Section 5.0.	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree
ITEM NO. 15 - Meeting Consensus Section 5 - Part 3 - Defect Process -Page 42 & 43 Title page and definitions will read as follows:	Disagree Agree Generally Agree Neutral
A CLEC/BellSouth identified defect will enter this process through the Change Management Team as a Type 6 Change Request. If the defect is validated internally, it will route through this process, and notification provided to the CLEC community via e-mail and web posting.	Somewhat Disagree Disagree
A Type 6 defect request is any non-type 1 change that corrects problems discovered in production versions of an application interface. These problems are where the interface is not working in accordance to the BellSouth baseline business requirements or the business rules that BellSouth has published or otherwise provided to the CLECs.	Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S1 Page 6 of 15
Issued: 3/20/2001	PAGE 6

In addition, if functional requirements agreed upon by BellSouth and the CLECs, results in inoperable functionality, even though software business requirements and business rules match; this will be addressed as a defect.	
These problems typically affect the CLEC's ability to exchange transactions with BellSouth and may include documentation that is in error, has missing information or is unclear in nature. Type 6 validated defects may not be managed using the Expedited Feature Process as discussed in Section 4, Part 3.	
Defect Change Requests will have three Impact Levels: • High Impact The failure causes impairment of critical system functions and no electronic workaround solution exists. • Medium Impact	
The failure causes impairment of critical system functions, though a workaround solution does exist. • Low Impact The failure causes inconvenience or annoyance.	
ITEM NO. 16 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 45	Generally Agree
	Generally Agree
Table 5-1. Type 6 Defect Process – STEP 1	Neutral
Accountability – BCCM & CCCM	Neutral
Accountability – BCCM & CCCM Sub-process – Activity	Neutral Somewhat Disagree
Accountability – BCCM & CCCM Sub-process – Activity IDENTIFY NEED	Neutral
Accountability – BCCM & CCCM Sub-process – Activity IDENTIFY NEED 1. Identify Defect. 2. Originator and CCCM or BCCM should complete the standardized	Neutral Somewhat Disagree
Accountability – BCCM & CCCM Sub-process – Activity IDENTIFY NEED 1. Identify Defect. 2. Originator and CCCM or BCCM should complete the standardized Change Request Form indicating that it is a Type 6. 3. Include description of business need and details of business impact.	Neutral Somewhat Disagree
Accountability – BCCM & CCCM Sub-process – Activity IDENTIFY NEED 1. Identify Defect. 2. Originator and CCCM or BCCM should complete the standardized Change Request Form indicating that it is a Type 6. 3. Include description of business need and details of business impact. 4. Attach related requirements and specification documents. These attachments must include the following, if appropriate: • PON	Neutral Somewhat Disagree
Accountability – BCCM & CCCM Sub-process – Activity IDENTIFY NEED 1. Identify Defect. 2. Originator and CCCM or BCCM should complete the standardized Change Request Form indicating that it is a Type 6. 3. Include description of business need and details of business impact. 4. Attach related requirements and specification documents. These attachments must include the following, if appropriate: PON OCN Specific Scenario	Neutral Somewhat Disagree
Accountability – BCCM & CCCM Sub-process – Activity IDENTIFY NEED 1. Identify Defect. 2. Originator and CCCM or BCCM should complete the standardized Change Request Form indicating that it is a Type 6. 3. Include description of business need and details of business impact. 4. Attach related requirements and specification documents. These attachments must include the following, if appropriate: PON OCN Specific Scenario Interface(s) affected Error message (if applicable)	Neutral Somewhat Disagree
Accountability – BCCM & CCCM Sub-process – Activity IDENTIFY NEED 1. Identify Defect. 2. Originator and CCCM or BCCM should complete the standardized Change Request Form indicating that it is a Type 6. 3. Include description of business need and details of business impact. 4. Attach related requirements and specification documents. These attachments must include the following, if appropriate: PON OCN Specific Scenario Interface(s) affected	Neutral Somewhat Disagree
Accountability – BCCM & CCCM Sub-process – Activity IDENTIFY NEED 1. Identify Defect. 2. Originator and CCCM or BCCM should complete the standardized Change Request Form indicating that it is a Type 6. 3. Include description of business need and details of business impact. 4. Attach related requirements and specification documents. These attachments must include the following, if appropriate: PON OCN Specific Scenario Interface(s) affected Error message (if applicable) Release or API version (if applicable) Release or API version (if applicable) Appropriate CCCM/BCCM submits Change Request Form and related information via e-mail to BellSouth Change Management	Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S1

TEM NO. 19 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
BELLSOUTH RECOMMENDATION 2 Bus Days for High Impact 3 Bus Days for Medium and Low Impact	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree Agree
1 Bus Days for High Impact 3 Bus Days for Medium and Low Impact	Somewhat Disagree Disagree
CLEC RECOMMENDATION	Generally Agree Neutral
Sub-process – CYCLE TIME	Agree
Internal Validation - BCCM	
Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 46 Table 5-1. Type 6 Defect Process - STEP 3	
ranking of the other)	
ITEM NO. 18 - Contested Consensus (Voters must disagree with one (1) of the following recommendations and indicate	
1 Bus Day for Medium and Low Impact – Time to be calculated from time of receipt with a cutoff time of 4:00 Pm Eastern Time.	
with a cutoff time of 4:00 PM Eastern Time.	
4 Hours for High Impact – Time to be calculated from time of receipt	
and process Crede invie	Disagree
Accountability – BCCM & CCCM Sub-process – CYCLE TIME	Somewhat Disagree
Table 5-1. Type 6 Defect Process – STEP 2	Generally Agree Neutral
Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 45	Generally Arres
ITEM NO. 17 - Meeting Consensus	
Cycle Time: N/A	
necessary)	
OUTPUTS: Completed Change Request Form (with related 4.	
Type 6 Change Request	•
INPUTS:	

Issued: 3/20/2001

Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 45 Table 5-1. Type 6 Defect Process - STEP 3 Sub-process - OUTPUTS Add the following bullet: • Status provided for High Impact Defects to originator via email within 24 hours.	Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 47 & 48 Table 5-1. Type 6 Defect Process - STEP 4 Accountability - BCCM Sub-process - Activity DEVELOP AND VALIDATE WORKAROUND (IF APPLICABLE) 1. Defect workaround identified 2. Change Request status change to "W" for workaround identified. 3. Workaround is communicated via email to originating CLEC and to the CLEC community via email and web posting. 4. If appropriate, communication to the CLEC community regarding workaround will be discussed via conference call. If it is determined that additional time is needed to develop workaround due to the complexity of the defect, notification will be provided to the CLEC community via email and web posting.	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 21 - Contested Consensus (Voters must disagree with one (1) of the following recommendations and indicate ranking of the other) Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 47 & 48 Table 5-1. Type 6 Defect Process - STEP 4 Sub-process - CYCLE TIME CLEC RECOMMENDATION 1 Bus Day for High and Medium Impact 4 Bus Days for Low Impact BELLSOUTH RECOMMENDATION 2 Bus Days for High Impct 4 Bus Days for Medium and Low Impact	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree

	Disagree
ITEM NO. 22 - Meeting Consensus Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 47 & 48 Table 5-1. Type 6 Defect Process - STEP 5 Accountability - BCCM Sub-process - Activity INTERNAL RESOLUTION PROCESS	☐ Agree ☐ Generally Agree ☐ Neutral ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Disagree
 Schedule and evaluate Defects based on capacity and business impacts to the CLECs and BellSouth. Provide status updates to the CLEC community via email as the status change until the defect is implemented. 	
ITEM NO. 23 - Contested Consensus (Voters must disagree with one of the following recommendations and indicate ranking of the other) Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 48 & 49 Table 5-1. Type 6 Defect Process - STEP 5	
Sub-process – CYCLE TIME CLEC RECOMMENDATION	Agree
Validated High and Medium Impact defects will be implemented within a 4-10 business day range, best effort. Low Impact defects will be implemented with a 4-20 business day range, best effort.	Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
BELLSOUTH RECOMMENDATION Validated High Impact Defects will be implemented within a 4-25 business day range, best effort. Medium Impact Defects will be implemented within 90 business days, best effort.	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
Low Impact defects will be implemented best effort.	
ITEM NO. 24 - Meeting Consensus Section 6 - Change Review - Prioritization - Release Package Development and Approval - Page 51 Part 1 - Change Review Meeting - 4 th paragraph NOTE:	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree

Issued: 3/20/2001

Status Meetings will occur monthly. Prioritization meetings will be scheduled to occur in March , June , September and December and will include the monthly status meeting agenda items.	
ITEM NO. 25 - Meeting Consensus Section 6 - Change Review - Prioritization - Release Package Development and Approval - Page 52 Part 2 - Change Review Package - 4th bullet: • BellSouth's estimate of the size and scope of each Change Request.	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 26 - Meeting Consensus Section 6 - Change Review - Prioritization - Release Package Development and Approval - Page 52-53 Part 3 - Prioritizing Change Requests - 10 th bullet: (Leave this bulleted item as originally stated) • Manual processes and documentation changes will be prioritized separately; however they will need to be synchronized with the electronic interface changes.	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 27 - Meeting Consensus Section 6 - Change Review - Prioritization - Release Package Development and Approval - Page 54 Part 4 - Developing and Approving Release Packages - 1 st bulleted item: • Sizing and sequencing of change requests will be accomplished at the Prioritization Meeting. CLECs may take into account the size and scope when prioritizing items.	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
TEM NO. 28 – Contested Consensus (Voters must disagree with one (1) of the following recommendations and indicate ranking of the other) Section 7 – Introduction and Retirement of Interfaces - Page 57 Retirement of Interfaces – 1st paragraph sentence	Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S1 Page 11 of 15
Issued: 3/20/2001	

rem NO. 31 - Contested Consensus (Voters must disagree with one of the following recommendations and indicate enking of the other) ection 8 - Escalation Process - Page 58 & 59	Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S1 Page 12 of 15
Retirement of Versions – Proposed Appeal Language CLEC may respond to Change Control with its desire to extend a etirement date. The CLEC must explain why the scheduled retirement ate is not acceptable by providing the impact to its business.	Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
TEM NO. 30 - Meeting Consensus Section 7 - Introduction and Retirement of Interfaces - Page	Agree Generally Agree
Retirement of Versions When software versions are retired, BellSouth will give the CLECs a 120	Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 29 - Meeting Consensus Section 7 – Introduction and Retirement of Interfaces - Page 57	☐ Agree ☐ Generally Agree ☐ Neutral
As active interfaces are retired, BellSouth will notify the CLECs through the Change Control Process and post a CLEC Notification Letter to the web six (6) months prior to the retirement of the interface.	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
BELLSOUTH RECOMMENDATION	Disagree
CLEC RECOMMENDATION As active interfaces are retired, BellSouth will notify the CLECs by submitting a Type 4 change request through the Change Control Process and post a CLEC Notification Letter to the web six (6) months prior to the retirement of the interface.	Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree

CLEC RECOMMENDATION	
 For Type 6 High and Medium Impact issues, the escalation process is agreed to allow BellSouth a one-day turnaround to provide a status for each cycle of escalation. For Type 6 Low Impact and Type 2-5 Expedite Process issues, the escalation process is agreed to allow BellSouth a three-day turnaround to provide a status for each cycle of escalation. 	Generally Agree
BELLSOUTH RECOMMENDATION	
 For Type 6 High Impact Issues, the escalation process is agreed to allow BellSouth a two (2) day turnaround to provide a status for each cycle of escalation. For Type 6 Medium and Low Impact issues, the escalation process is agreed to allow BellSouth a five (5) day turnaround to provide a status for each cycle of escalation. For Types 2-5 Expedite Process issues, the escalation process is agreed to allow BellSouth a three (3) day turnaround to provide a status for each cycle of escalation. 	
ITEM NO. 32 - Meeting Consensus Section 8 - Escalation Process - Contact List for Escalation	Agree
- Type 2-6 Changes - Page 62	Generally Agree Neutral
1 st Paragraph:	Somewhat Disagree Disagree
Type 2-5 Changes: Within 5 business days of receipt (4 from acknowledgment) BellSouth Change Control appropriate executives will reply through BellSouth Change Control with BellSouth's position and explanation for that position.	
ITEM NO. 33 - Contested Consensus (Voters must disagree with one of the following recommendations and indicate ranking of the other) Section 8 - Escalation Process - Contact List for Escalation - Type 2-6 Changes - Page 62	
2 nd Paragraph: CLEC RECOMMENDATION	
Type 6, High and Medium Impact Changes: Within one (1) business day of receipt, BellSouth Change Control appropriate executives will reply through BellSouth Change Control with BellSouth's position and explanation for that position.	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
	o. 00.

Type 6 High Impact Changes: Within two (2) business days of receipt, BellSouth Change Control appropriate executives will reply through BellSouth Change Control with BellSouth's position and explanation for that position. Type 6 Medium and Low Impact Changes: Within five (5) business days of receipt, BellSouth Change Control appropriate executives will reply through BellSouth Change Control with BellSouth's position and explanation for that position.	Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
with one of the following recommendations and indicate ranking of the other) Section 8 – Dispute Resolution Process - Page 64 CLEC RECOMMENDATION In the event that an issue arises from Section 9, Change to this Process, or arises from some other Section and is not resolved through the Escalation Process as described herein, including (1) escalation within each company to the person with ultimate authority for Change Control operations, and (2) the services of a joint investigative team, when appropriate, comprised of representatives from BellSouth and the affected CLECs, resolution of the dispute shall be accomplished as set forth below: • Either BellSouth or any CLEC affected by the dispute may request mediation through the appropriate state regulatory agency, if available. If mediation is requested, parties shall participate in good faith.	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
 Without necessity for prior mediation, either BellSouth or any CLEC affected by the dispute may file a formal complaint with the appropriate state regulatory agency, requesting resolution of the issue. All participants in the CCP shall be provided timely notice of any mediations or formal complaints. 	Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S1 Page 14 of 15
BELLSOUTH RECOMMENDATION	Agree

Issued: 3/20/2001 PAGE 14

In the event that an issue is not resolved through the Escalation Process as described herein, including (1) escalation within each company to the person with ultimate authority for Change Control operations, and (2) the services of a joint investigative team, when appropriate, comprised of representatives from BellSouth and the affected CLECs. Resolution of the dispute shall be accomplished as set forth below: • Either BellSouth or any CLEC affected by the dispute may request mediation through the State Public Service Commission, if available. If mediation is requested, parties shall participate in good faith. If the mediation results in the resolution of the dispute, that resolution shall apply to all CLECs affected by the dispute. • Without necessity for prior mediation, either BellSouth or any CLEC affected by the dispute may file a formal complaint with the appropriate state regulatory agency, requesting resolution of the issue.	Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
---	--

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S1 Page 15 of 15

Issued: 3/20/2001 PAGE 15

ITEM NO. 1 - Meeting Consensus	Agree ATET Simb Por
Section 1—Introduction—Page 7	Agree – AT&T, Birch, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia,
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS – 100%	Worldcom Generally Agree - Time/Warner
	Neutral
	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree
ITEM NO. 2 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST,
Section 1 – Introduction – Page 8	ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Time/Warner
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Generally Agree - Worldcom
	Neutral
	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree
ITEM NO. 3 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST,
Section 3 - Introduction - Page 11 & 12	ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Time/Warner
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS 100%	Generally Agree - Worldcom
	Neutral
	Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 4 - Meeting Consensus	
Section 3 – Introduction – Page 12	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Rhythms,
STOCK THEFT CONTRIBUTE STOCK TO THE CONTRIBUTE OF THE CONTRIBUTE O	Generally Agree - Network One,
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 90%	Sprint, Telcordia,
3070	Neutral
	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree - Time/Warner
ITEM NO. 5 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST,
Section 4 — Part 1 – Type 1 Detail Process Flow – Page 18	ITC/Deltacom, Rhythms, Telcordia, Time/Warner
	Generally Agree - Worldcom Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree - Sprint
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 90%	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree - Sprint
	Disagree - sprint

:Ket INO. 00-000 .IMB-S2

FINAL TALLY

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S2 Page 2 of 10

PAGE 2

	T
ITEM NO. 6 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Part 1 - Type 1 Detail Process Flow - Page 18 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Worldcom Generally Agree - Network One, Time/Warner Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 7 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Part 2 - Types 2-5 Process Flow - Page 26 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Time/Warner, Worldcom Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 8 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Part 3 - Types 2-5 Exception/Expedited Feature Process - Pages 33-37 WITHDRAWAL INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, Network One, Telcordia, Time/Warner, Worldcom Generally Agree - ITC/Deltacom, Rhythms, Sprint Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 9 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Part 3 - Types 2-5 Exception/Expedited Feature Process SPLIT FROM "DEFECT PROCESS" INTO SEPARATE SECTION FOR EXPEDITED FEATURES ONLY. INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Telcordia, Time/Warner, Worldcom Generally Agree - Rhythms Neutral - Sprint Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 10 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Part 3 - Expedited Feature Process -Page 37 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Telcordia Generally Agree - Network One, Rhythms, Sprint, Time/Warner Neutral - Worldcom Somewhat Disagree Disagree

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S2 Page 3 of 10

ITEM NO. 11 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Part 3 - Expedited Feature Process -Page 39 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, Network One, Telcordia, Time/Warner Generally Agree - ITC/Deltacom, Rhythms, Sprint, Worldcom
	Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 12 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, Network
Section 4 – Part 3 – Expedited Feature Process -Page 39	One, Time/Warner Generally Agree -
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	ITC/Deltacom, Sprint, Telcordia, Worldcom Neutral - Rhythms
	Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 13 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, Network
Section 4 – Part 3 – Expedited Feature Process -Page 41	One, Telcordia Generally Agree –
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	ITC/Deltacom, Time/Warner, Worldcom
	Neutral - Rhythms Somewhat Disagree - Sprint Disagree
ITEM NO. 14 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, Network
Section 5 – Part 3 – Defect Process -Pages 42 – 50	One, Sprint, Telcordia, Time/Warπer
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Generally Agree - Rhythms Neutral - ITC/Deltacom Somewhat Disagree -
	Worldcom Disagree
ITEM NO. 15 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST,
Section 5 - Part 3 - Defect Process -Page 42 & 43	ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Rhythms
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 90%	Generally Agree - Telcordia, Worldcom
Issued: 3/20/2001	

Issued: 3/20/2001

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S2 Page 4 of 10

	Neutral Somewhat Disagree - Sprint Disagree - Time/Warner
ITEM NO. 16 - Meeting Consensus Section 5 – Defect Process - Page 45	Agree – AT&T, Birch, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Telcordia, Time/Warner
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Generally Agree - Rhythms, Worldcom
	Neutral - Sprint
	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree
ITEM NO. 17 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST,
Section 5 – Defect Process - Page 45	ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Sprint, Telcordia, Worldcom
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Generally Agree - Rhythms,
	Neutral
	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree
ITEM NO. 18 - Contested Consensus (Voters must disagree	
with one (1) of the following recommendations and indicate	Agree - AT&T, Birch, ITC/Deltacom,
ranking of the other) Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 46	Network One, Rhythms, Sprint, Time/Warner, Worldcom
	Generally Agree - Telcordia
CLEC RECOMMENDATION	Neutral
	Somewhat Disagree
CONTESTED CONSENSUS - 90%	Disagree - BST
BELLSOUTH RECOMMENDATION	Agree - BST
	Generally Agree
CONTESTED CONSENSUS – 10%	Neutral
	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree - AT&T, Birch,
	ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Rhythms, Sprint, Time/Warner, Worldcom
ITEM NO. 19 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, Network
Section 5 — Defect Process - Page 45	One, Time/Warner
	Generally Agree -
Issued: 3/20/2001	ITC/Deltacom, Rhythms, PAGE 4

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S2 Page 5 of 10

INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 90% ITEM NO. 20 - Meeting Consensus Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 47 & 48 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Worldcom Neutral Somewhat Disagree - Sprint Disagree - Telcordia Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Sprint, Telcordia, Time/Warner Generally Agree - Network One, Rhythms, Worldcom
	Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 21 - Contested Consensus (Voters must disagree with one (1) of the following recommendations and indicate ranking of the other) Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 47 & 48	Agree – AT&T, Birch, ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Worldcom
CLEC RECOMMENDATION CONTESTED CONSENSUS - 80%	Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree - BST, Time/Warner
BELLSOUTH RECOMMENDATION	======================================
CONTESTED CONSENSUS – 20%	Somewhat Disagree Disagree – AT&T, Birch, ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Worldcom
ITEM NO. 22 - Meeting Consensus Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 47 & 48 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Sprint, Telcordia, Time/Warner Generally Agree - Network One, Rhythms, Worldcom Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S2 Page 6 of 10

ITEM NO. 23 - Contested Consensus (Voters must disagree	
with one of the following recommendations and indicate	
ranking of the other)	
Section 5 – Defect Process - Page 48 & 49	Agree Area Inches
	Agree - AT&T, ITC/Deltacom, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia,
CLEC RECOMMENDATION	Worldcom
	Generally Agree - Birch,
CONTESTED CONSENSUS - 80%	Network One
	Neutral
	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree – BST, Time/Warner
BELLSOUTH RECOMMENDATION	
	Agree - BST
CONTESTED CONSENSUS – 20%	Generally Agree
	Neutral - Time/Warner
	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree - AT&T, ITC/Deltacom, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Worldcom, Network One
ITEM NO. 24 - Meeting Consensus	Agree Azez Bint Box
Section 6 — Change Review — Prioritization — Release	Agree – AT&T, Birch, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Network One,
Package Development and Approval - Page 51	Sprint, Telcordia, Time/Warner, Worldcom
	Generally Agree - Rhythms
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Neutral
	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree
ITEM NO. 25 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, Network
Section 6 – Change Review – Prioritization – Release	One, Rhythms, Sprint,
Package Development and Approval - Page 52	Telcordia, Time/Warner, Worldcom
	Generally Agree - ITC/Deltacom
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Neutral
Issued: 3/20/2001	

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S2 Page 7 of 10

	Somewhat Disagree Disagree
	Jougice
ITEM NO. 26 Martin Co.	
ITEM NO. 26 - Meeting Consensus Section 6 – Change Review – Prioritization – Release	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, Sprint, Telcordia, Worldcom
Package Development and Approval - Page 52-53	Generally Agree -
in the state of t	ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Rhythms, Time/Warner
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Neutral
	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree
ITEM NO. 27 - Meeting Consensus	
Section 6 - Change Review - Prioritization - Release	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST,
Package Development and Approval - Page 54	ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Sprint, Telcordia, Time/Warner
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Generally Agree - Rhythms,
	Worldcom Neutral
	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree
ITEM NO. 28 – Contested Consensus (Voters must disagree	
with one (1) of the following recommendations and indicate	ĺ
ranking of the other) Section 7 – Introduction and Retirement of Interfaces - Page	Agree - AT&T, Birch, ITC/Deltacom, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia.
57	Worldcom
	Generally Agree Neutral
CLEC RECOMMENDATION	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree - BST, Network One,
CONTESTED CONSENSUS - 70%	Time/Warner
	=======================================
BELLSOUTH RECOMMENDATION	Agree - BST, Network One,
	Time/Warner Generally Agree

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S2 Page 8 of 10

	T
CONTESTED CONSENSUS – 30%	Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree - AT&T, Birch, ITC/Deltacom, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Worldcom
ITEM NO. 29 - Meeting Consensus	
Section 7 – Introduction and Retirement of Interfaces - Page 57 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, Network One, Rhythms, Time/Warner Generally Agree - ITC/Deltacom, Sprint, Telcordia, Worldcom Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 30 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST,
Section 7 – Introduction and Retirement of Interfaces - Page 57 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Worldcom Generally Agree - Time/Warner Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 31 - Contested Consensus (Voters must disagree	
with one of the following recommendations and indicate	Agree - AT&T, Birch, ITC/Deltacom,
ranking of the other) Section 8 - Escalation Process - Page 58 & 59	Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Worldcom Generally Agree – Network One, Time/Warner
CLEC RECOMMENDATION	Neutral Somewhat Disagree
CONTESTED CONSENSUS – 90%	Disagree - вsт
BELLSOUTH RECOMMENDATION	Agree - BST

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S2 Page 9 of 10

CONTESTED CONSENSUS – 10%	Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree - AT&T, Birch, ITC/Deltacom, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Worldcom, Network One, Time/Warner
ITEM NO. 32 - Meeting Consensus Section 8 - Escalation Process - Contact List for Escalation - Type 2-6 Changes - Page 62 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100%	Agree - AT&T, Birch, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Time/Warner Generally Agree - Worldcom Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 33 - Contested Consensus (Voters must disagree with one of the following recommendations and indicate ranking of the other) Section 8 - Escalation Process - Contact List for Escalation - Type 2-6 Changes - Page 62 CLEC RECOMMENDATION CONTESTED CONSENSUS - 80%	Agree - AT&T, Birch, ITC/Deltacom, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Worldcom Generally Agree - Network One Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree - BST, Time/Warner
BELLSOUTH RECOMMENDATION CONTESTED CONSENSUS – 20%	Agree - BST, Time/Warner Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree - AT&T, Birch, ITC/Deltacom, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Worldcom

ITEM NO. 34 - Contested Consensus (Voters must disagree	
with one of the following recommendations and indicate	Agree - AT&T, Birch, ITC/Deltacom,
ranking of the other) Section 8 – Dispute Resolution Process - Page 64	Network One, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Time/Warner
occion o - Dispute Resolution Process - Page 64	Generally Agree - Worldcom
CLEC RECOMMENDATION	Neutral
	Somewhat Disagree
CONTESTED CONSENSUS – 90%	Disagree - BST
BELLSOUTH RECOMMENDATION	Agree - BST
	Generally Agree
CONTESTED CONSENSUS - 10%	Neutral
	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree – AT&T, Birch, ITC/Deltacom, Network One, Rhythms, Sprint, Telcordia, Time/Warner, Worldcom

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S2 Page 10 of 10

"DRAFT"

CLEC Participant Company Name:	Date:
ITEM NO. 1 - Meeting Consensus Section 3 - Change Control Decision Process - Page 11 Type 6 - CLEC Impacting Defects All references to "business or software requirements" will be replaced with "user requirements" throughout this definition. ITEM NO. 2 - Meeting Consensus	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree Agree
Section 4 – Change Control Process Flow – Page 17 Type 1 Detail Process Flow – Step 2 – Cycle Time Cycle Time will reflect the following: BellSouth will provide email notification to the CLECs via Change Control of Type 1 system outages within 15 minutes of the outage verification. In addition, BellSouth will continue to post the outage information on the CCP website. (Table 4.1 description and content on page 16 will also be updated to reflect the "language" above in Step 2 – Initial Notification cycle time)	Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 3 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5 Process flow - Page 25 Step 3 - Review Change Request for Acceptance Additional language - Sub-processes/Activities BellSouth may determine that a CLEC initiated change request cannot be accepted because of cost, industry direction or because it is considered not technically feasible to implement. If requested, the appropriate BellSouth SME will participate in the Monthly Status Meeting to address the reason for rejection and discuss alternatives with the CLEC community. The SME must be provided a minimum of two-week advance notice to participate in the upcoming Monthly Status Meeting.	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5 Process flow - Page 25 Step 3 - Review Change Request for Acceptance Additional language - Sub-processes/Activities OBF Issues All change requests that are being actively discussed at OBF, or are on the agenda to be discussed, will be deferred. If the issue is not active and will not be considered within the next six (6) months, and there is agreement	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S3 Page 1 of 12

"DRAFT"

between BellSouth and affected CLECs to proceed prior to an OBF	
resolution, BellSouth will determine if it can support the request.	
ITEM NO. 5 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5	Agree Generally Agree
Process flow - Page 26 Step 4 - Prepare for Change Review Meeting	NeutralSomewhat Disagree
Activity #5 – Provide preliminary size and scope information on each pending change request to CLECs.	Disagree
OUTPUTS: Preliminary size and scope on each Pending change request.	
Note: Outstanding action item to further define the characteristics of Large, Medium and Small sizing metric.	
ITEM NO. 6 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5	Generally Agree
Process flow - Page 26	Neutral
Step 4 – Prepare for Change Review Meeting	Somewhat Disagree
Additional language – Sub-processes/Activities	Disagree
The sizing information provided with the Change Review Meeting package	
is a preliminary estimate of the work effort. After prioritization, each	
interface is assessed in depth to determine the scope of the change request. Based on this assessment, an adjustment in the sizing may be required.	
assessment, an adjustment in the sizing may be required.	
ITEM NO. 7 - Meeting Consensus	
Section 4 – Change Control Process Flow – Types 2-5	Agree
Process flow – Page 27	Generally Agree
Step 5 – Conduct Change Review Meeting	Neutral
Monthly Status Meetings	Somewhat Disagree
Activity #4 & #5:	Disagree
A Perious ionus and a citation	
4. Review issues and action items and assign owners. 5. Present new change requests submitted at a second	
5. Present new change requests submitted since previous Monthly Status Meeting.	
and the state of t	Docket No. 00-00079
NPUTS:	JMB-S3
Preliminary size and scope on each Pending change	Page 2 of 12
request	
TEM NO. 8 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
oction at the control of the control	☐ Agree☐ Generally Agree
Type 2.5	i i Generaliv Adres
ection 4 – Change Control Process Flow – Types 2-5 Process flow – Page 27	
rioritization Meetings	Neutral Somewhat Disagree

"DRAFT"

Activity #3	Disagree
 BellSouth presents the preliminary size and scope of each change request. BellSouth presents the number of major releases and date targeted for the next 12 months. 	·
ITEM NO. 9 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5 Process flow - Page 28 & 29 Step 7 - Internal Change Management Process Activity #1 & #2	☐ Agree ☐ Generally Agree ☐ Neutral ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Disagree
 Both BellSouth and CLECs will perform analysis, impact, sizing and estimating activities to the Candidate Change Requests. This ensures that participating parties are reviewing capacity and impacts to schedules before assigning resources to activities. Sizing and sequencing of prioritized change requests will begin with the top priority items and continue down through the list until the capacity constraints have been reached. 	
• CLEC Analysis	
TEM NO. 10 - Meeting Consensus	Г Ания a
ection 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5	Agree Generally A
rocess flow—Page 29 : 30	Generally Agree Neutral
ep 8 – Conduct Release Package Meeting	
ctivity #4 , #5, #7 & #8	Somewhat Disagree
#4 Non orb. 1.1.1.1	Disagree
#4 - Non-scheduled change requests will be combined with the new pending requests and re-ranked quarterly to ensure a current list of priorities is always available. All change requests are considered for	
every release.	
#5 - Based on BST/CLEC consensus create the Approved Release	
Package. CLECs, based on group consensus, may request changes to the proposed scope (like for like-size CRs). BellSouth will evaluate	
and determine the impacts of the requested changes and re-present the proposed package to the CLEC community.	
#7 - Establish date for initial Release Management Project Meeting for	
the next new release.	Doolest N. On occase
#8 - All Change Requests that are in the approved scheduled release will be scheduled to "S" status for "Scheduled".	Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S3 Page 3 of 12
INPUTS:	1 agc 3 01 12
Remove "Two Scenarios" in the first bulleted statement.	
Issued: 3/20/2001	

"DRAFT"

Add 4th bulleted statement:	
CLEC Analysis	•
OUTPUTS:	
Remove 5 th bulleted statement "Non-Scheduled Change Requests"	
Change 6 th bulleted statement to read:	
Date for initial Release Management Project Meeting for	
newly established releases.	
ITEM NO. 11 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5	Generally Agree
Process flow - Page 31	Neutral
Step 9 – Create Release Package Notification	
Step 3 - Create Release Lackage Notification	Somewhat Disagree
D Inverse	Disagree
INPUTS	
The 1 st bulleted statement should read:	
 Approved Release Package 	
.,	
ITEM NO. 12 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
and the control of th	
Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5	Generally Agree
Process flow - Page 31	Neutral
Step 10 – Release Management and Implementation	Somewhat Disagree
Activity #3	
•	Disagree
3. BellSouth User Requirements for software changes will be	
presented to the CLECs. If needed, changes will be incorporated	
and requirements re-baselined.	
ITEM NO. 13 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
Section 4 - Part 3 - Expedited Feature Process - Page 35	Generally Agree
	Neutral
Title Page and definitions will read as follows:	
	Somewhat Disagree
An Expedited Feature is the inability for a CLEC to process certain types	Disagree
of LSR's based on the existing functionality to BellSouth's Operations	
Support Systems (OSSs) that are in the scope of CCP. The change request	
for an expedite must provide details of the business impact and will fall	
into one of two categories:	Docket No. 00-00079
 A submitted defect that has been re-classified as a feature where 	JMB-S3
the CLEC/BellSouth has determined should be expedited due to	-
impact	Page 4 of 12
An ordering enhancement to an existing interface where the	
CLEC/PollCouth has determined about the second to the	
CLEC/BellSouth has determined should be expedited due to	

"DRAFT"

in a set	
impact	
Do alossified Defeate	•
Re-classified Defects	
When a submitted defect is re-classified as a feature, the CLEC/BellSouth will be notified by Change Control in the standard defect validation. The CLEC will have the ability to ask BellSouth to expedite the reclassified feature by updating the change request, marking it as an expedite and sending back to Change Control. The change request will then follow through the Types 2-5 Expedited Feature process using agreed upon intervals.	
Ordering enhancements to an existing interface	
A CLEC/BellSouth will also have the ability to submit a Type 25 change request as an expedited feature request for an ordering enhancement to an existing interface where the functionality does not currently exist in BellSouth's offered interfaces .	
 For both re-classified defects and enhancements to an existing interface, the rules surrounding the expedited feature request will be: Must be an ordering enhancement to an existing interface Will follow the Expedited Feature process flow described below which is based on the current Types 2-5 process flow using agreed upon intervals with the exception of Steps 4-6 that are eliminated. The CLEC/BellSouth will be required to give impacts and the consequences for not implementing the feature in the current, next, or minor release, best effort. 	
ITEM NO. 14 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
Section 4 – Part 3 – Expedited Feature Process – Page 39	Agree
Step 4 – Internal Change Management Process	Generally Agree
Additional Language after Activity #1:	Neutral
Additional Language after Activity #1.	Somewhat Disagree
Expedited Features will be implemented in the current, next release, or minor release, best effort.	Disagree
minor release, best effort.	Da-1-4 N. 00 00070
CVCIETIME	Docket No. 00-00079
CYCLE TIME	JMB-S3
Casa by Casa basis not to annual 25 1	Page 5 of 12
Case by Case basis not to exceed 25 days.	
ITEM NO 45 40 41	
ITEM NO. 15 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5	Generally Agree
Process flow - Page 31	Neutral
Step 5 - Release Management and Implementation	Somewhat Disagree
Activity #4	Disagree
	PISAYIEE

"DRAFT"

 BellSouth Documentation changes, including business rule changes associated with expedited features, will be provided if applicable. 	
ITEM NO. 16 - Meeting Consensus Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 41 Title Page and Definition 2 nd Paragraph will read: A Type 6 defect request is any non-type 1 change that corrects problems discovered in production versions of an application interface. These problems are where the interface is not working in accordance to the BellSouth baseline user requirements or the business rules that BellSouth has published or otherwise provided to the CLECs.	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
3 rd Paragraph will read: In addition, if functional requirements agreed upon by BellSouth and the CLECs, results in inoperable functionality, even though software user requirements and business rules match; this will be addressed as a defect.	
 ITEM NO. 17 - Meeting Consensus Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 44 Table 5-1 - Type 6 Detail Process Flow - Step 3 Sub-processes/Activities - INTERNAL VALIDATION Additional bulleted items - 5th and 6th bullets If CLEC does not agree with the validation, the CLEC may appeal the issue or escalate. Based on detail analysis, BellSouth will reaffirm the impact level that is stated on the request. 	☐ Agree ☐ Generally Agree ☐ Neutral ☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Disagree ☐ Docket No. 00-00079 ☐ JMB-S3 ☐ Page 6 of 12
ITEM NO. 18 - Meeting Consensus Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 44 Table 5-1 - Type 6 Detail Process Flow - Step 3 - Internal Validation CYCLE TIME 2 Business Days for High Impact 3 Business Days for Medium and Low Impact	☐ Agree☐ Generally Agree☐ Neutral☐ Somewhat Disagree☐ Disagree

"DRAFT"

ITEM NO. 19 - Meeting Consensus Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 45 Table 5-1 - Type 6 Detail Process Flow - Step 4 - Develop and Validate Workaround CYCLE TIME	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
2 Business Days for High Impact	
4 Business Days for Medium and Low Impact	
ITEM NO. 20 - Meeting Consensus Section 6 - Change Review - Prioritization - Release Package Development and Approval - Page 48 Part 1 - Change Review Meeting Ist Paragraph will read as follows: The Change Review meeting provides the forum for reviewing and prioritizing Pending Change Requests, generating Candidate Change Requests, submitting Candidate Change Requests for sizing, and reviewing the status of all release projects underway. Status update meetings will be held monthly and are open to all CLECs. Meetings will be structured	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
according to category (pre-order/order, maintenance, manual and documentation, etc.). Prioritization meetings will be held quarterly. ITEM NO. 21 - Meeting Consensus Section 6 - Change Review - Prioritization - Release	Agree Generally Agree
Package Development and Approval – Page 48 Part 2 – Change Review Package	Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
4th bulleted statement will read: BellSouth's preliminary estimate of the size and scope of each Change Request.	
ITEM NO. 22 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
Section 6 – Change Review – Prioritization – Release	Generally Agree
Package Development and Approval – Page 49 Part 3 – Prioritizing Change Requests	Neutral
Prioritizing Voting Rules	Somewhat Disagree Disagree
New 4 th bulleted statement will read:	
Types 3, 4, and 5 change requests will be prioritized (non-expedites)	
Issued: 3/20/2001	PAGE 7

"DRAFT"

6 th bulleted statement will read: • Forced Ranking (1 to N, with 1 being the highest) will be used.	·
 New 7th bulleted statement will read: CLECs may choose to vote "no" on change requests that may potentially negatively impact its business or have little value to the CLEC. If a majority of CLECs vote "no" on any certain change request, that request will not be implemented. 	
ITEM NO. 23 - Meeting Consensus Section 6 - Change Review - Prioritization - Release Package Development and Approval - Page 51 Part 4 - Developing and Approving Release Packages	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree
New 3 rd bulleted statement will read:	Disagree
 Non-scheduled change requests will be combined with the new pending requests and re-ranking quarterly to ensure a current list of priorities is always available. All change requests are considered for every release. 	
New 2 nd paragraph will read:	
During the Release Package Meeting, BellSouth will present its proposed release package for the next release. BST/CLEC consensus will be used to create the Approved Release Package. CLECs, based on group consensus, may request changes to the proposed scope (like for like-size CRs). BellSouth will evaluate and determine the impacts of the requested changes and re-present the proposed package to the CLEC community.	
ITEM NO. 24 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
Section 7—Introduction and Retirement of Interfaces – Page 52 Introduction of New Interfaces	Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree
BellSouth will introduce new interfaces to the CLEC community as part of the Change Control Process. BellSouth will seek to conform to the notification process for Type 4 (BellSouth Originated) changes as described in this document. In the event that BellSouth is forced to deviate	Disagree
from the Type 4 (BellSouth Originated) process for new non-impacting interface functionality, BellSouth will notify all CLECs of the deviation as promptly as possible. A description of the proposed interface will be submitted to the BCCM. The BCCM will add an agenda item to discuss the new interface at the monthly status meeting. BellSouth will be given 30-45 minutes to present information on the proposed interface. If	Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S3 Page 8 of 12

"DRAFT"

BellSouth requests additional time for the presentation, a separate meeting will be scheduled to review the proposed interface, so that, the information can be presented in its entirety. The objective will be to identify interest in the new interface and obtain input from the CLEC community. BellSouth will provide specifications on the interface being developed to the CLEC community. As new interfaces are deployed, they will be added to the scope of this document, as appropriate, based on the use by the CLEC and requested changes will be managed by this process.	
ITEM NO. 25 - Meeting Consensus	Agree
Section 7 – Introduction and Retirement of Interfaces – Page 53	Generally Agree Neutral
Retirement of Interfaces	Somewhat Disagree
1 st Paragraph – 1 st sentence will read:	Disagree
As active interfaces are retired, BellSouth will notify the CLECs through the Change Control Process and post a CLEC Notification Letter to the web six (6) months prior to the retirement of the interface.	
ITEM NO. 26 - Meeting Consensus Section 8 - Escalation Process - Guidelines - Page 54	Agree Generally Agree
New 7 th bulleted statement will read:	Neutral Somewhat Disagree
• For Type 6 High Impact issues, the escalation process is agreed to allow BellSouth a one (1) day turnaround to provide a status for each cycle of escalation. For Type 6 Medium and Low Impact issues, the escalation process is agreed to allow BellSouth a two (2) to five (5) day turnaround to provide a status for each cycle of escalation.	Disagree
New 8 th bulleted statement will read:	Docket No. 00-00079
• For Types 2-5 Expedite Process issues, the escalation process is agreed to allow BellSouth a three (3) day turnaround to provide a status for each cycle of escalation.	JMB-S3 Page 9 of 12
ITEM NO. 27 - Meeting Consensus Section 8 - REMOVE - Contact List for Escalation - Types 2-6 Changes - Page 58	Agree Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree

"DRAFT"

"Guidelines" on Page 54.	Disagree
ITEM NO. 28 - Meeting Consensus Appendix - Sub-Team Guidelines The following "language" will be added as an Appendix to define the	Agree Generally Agree Neutral
"Sub-Team Definition and Roles/Responsibilities":	Somewhat Disagree Disagree
A Sub-Team will be formed for issues that are more effectively addressed in a small group setting.	
The Sub-Team will consist of CLECs and BellSouth who volunteer to participate in meeting(s) to address a specific issue. This team will be responsible for presenting information and making recommendations to the CLEC participants of Change Control.	
The Change Control Management Team will be responsible for coordinating meetings and the flow of communications.	
ITEM NO. 29 - Meeting Consensus Section 9 - CHANGES TO THE PROCESS - Page 62	☐ Agree ☐ Generally Agree ☐ Neutral
The current, approved version of this process document will be stored under the component name "Ccp.doc" (the date of the latest CCP document will be included in the file name). The BellSouth Change Control Manager BCCM (and alternate) will be the only persons authorized to update the document version.	☐ Somewhat Disagree ☐ Disagree
Requests for changes to the Change Control Process may be submitted to the BellSouth Change Control Manager (BCCM) using the Change Request form located in the Appendix A. Cosmetic changes (format, typographical errors, clarifications of meaning, etc.) may be made and published by the BCCM (or alternate) without further review. Other changes will be reviewed at the monthly Change Review status meetings following receipt of the request, if included in the published meeting agenda. The CCP participants present at the meeting (in person or by teleconference) will reach an	
initial determination regarding the requested change(s) by "consensus". For this purpose consensus will mean that no participant has serious objection to the determination of the group.	
 The following initial determinations may be applied: Meeting Consensus (BellSouth and the other meeting participants have no serious objection to the change. The change will be balloted for Industry Consensus with the indication that a meeting consensus was reached.) Contested Issue (BellSouth and the other meeting 	Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S3 Page 10 of 12
participants are unable to reach consensus and the proposals	

"DRAFT"

of the parties are firm. The proposals will be balloted for Industry Consensus and the structure of the ballot will indicate that a choice between alternatives must be made.)

- Not Ready for Balloting (BellSouth and the other meeting participants are unable to reach consensus and the proposals of the parties are not firm. The request will not be balloted and will remain open for review during subsequent monthly meetings. The CCP participants will continue to use the associated current change control process. Working documentation reflecting both the current and proposed language may be created to facilitate further discussion.)
- Implement as Cosmetic (BellSouth and the other meeting participants determine that the requested change is a clarification of meaning with no potential negative impact. The change will be implemented and the Change Request will be updated to implemented status and update distributed as per the normal process.)

Subsequent to this initial review the BCCM and a CLEC representative appointed by the CLECs participating in the review shall prepare an official E-mail ballot for distribution to determine the Industry Consensus. The official Industry Consensus ballot will detail the change(s) being requested, and the significant arguments presented for and against the change during the review. As noted above, the ballot will indicate whether issues are being voted upon as the result of a Meeting Consensus or as a Contested Issue. Each issue presented on the ballot will contain a statement of the change to be approved and in the case of a Contested Issue, a summary of arguments for and arguments against the alternatives. The ballot will be distributed one week following the Status Meeting. CLEC's and BellSouth will have one week in which to cast their votes. Only ballots transmitted before midnight of the due date will be counted. BellSouth and each CLEC are allowed one vote on each issue presented on the ballot. The CCCM, or other designated individual will cast each CLEC's votes. The BCCM, or other designated individual will cast BellSouth's votes.

The ballot (a sample ballot may be found in the Appendix) will allow BellSouth and the CLECs to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the proposed change across a five-step continuum as shown here:

A	В	С	D	E
Agree	Generally	Neutral	Somewhat	Disagree
	Agree		Disagree	

When a Contested Issue is presented on the ballot there will be a continuum for each of the alternatives and the voter must disagree

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S3 Page 11 of 12

"DRAFT"

with one (and only one) of the two.

Industry Consensus will exist and the change will be implemented whenever two-thirds of votes cast by the due date are cast in categories A through D. BellSouth may not be able to support all requested changes to the process as proposed. BellSouth will provide a supporting reason(s) to substantiate its position. A CLEC may seek relief through the escalation process if dissatisfied with BellSouth's response. No consensus will exist if over 1/3 of votes for a change are cast in category E –"disagree".

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S3 Page 12 of 12

ITEM NO. 1 - Meeting Consensus Section 3 - Change Control Decision Process - Page 11 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Sprint, Telcordia, Ztel Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 2 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Page 17 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Sprint, Telcordia, Ztel Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 3 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 66.6% - APPROVED	Agree - BST, Ztel Generally Agree - Sprint, Telcordia Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree - AT&T, ITC/Deltacom
ITEM NO. 4 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5 Process Flow - Page 25 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, BST, Generally Agree - ITC/Deltacom, Ztel Neutral Somewhat Disagree - Sprint, Telcordia Disagree
ITEM NO. 5 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5 Process Flow - Page 26 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 83.3% - APPROVED	Agree - BST, Ztel Generally Agree - Sprint, Telcordia Neutral Somewhat Disagree - AT&T Disagree - ITC/Deltacom

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S4 Page 1 of 7

ITEM NO. 6 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, BST, Ztel
Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5	Generally Agree - Sprint,
Process Flow - Page 26	Telcordia Neutral — ITC/Deltacom
	Somewhat Disagree
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Disagree
	Jisugies
ITEM NO. 7 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, BST, ITC/Deltacom,
Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5	Ztel
Process Flow - Page 27	Generally Agree – Sprint,
INDUCTOV CONCENCIA 4000/ APPROVED	Neutral
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Somewhat Disagree
	Disagree
ITEM NO. 8 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, BST, ITC/Deltacom,
Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5	Ztel
Process Flow - Page 27	Generally Agree
	Neutral
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS – 83.3% - APPROVED	Somewhat Disagree - Sprint
	Disagree - Telcordia
ITEM NO. 9 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - BST, Ztel
Section 4 – Change Control Process Flow – Types 2-5	Generally Agree
Process Flow - Pages 28 & 29	Neutral
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS 22 20/ DISABBROVER	Somewhat Disagree
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS – 33.3% - DISAPPROVED	Disagree - AT&T, ITC/Deltacom, Sprint, Telcordia
	Sprint, Teleordia
ITEM NO. 10 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - BST, Ztel
Section 4 – Change Control Process Flow – Types 2-5	Generally Agree - Sprint,
Process Flow – Pages 29 - 30	Telcordia Neutral
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS CC CO/ APPROVED	Somewhat Disagree
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS – 66.6% - APPROVED	Disagree - AT&T, ITC/Deltacom
	=:549:66 - Alai, ilc/beltacom

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S4 Page 2 of 7

JMB-S4 Page 3 of 7

	•
ITEM NO. 11 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5 Process Flow - Page 31 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Sprint, Telcordia, Ztel Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 12 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5 Process Flow - Page 31 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, BST, Sprint, Ztel Generally Agree - Telcordia Neutral Somewhat Disagree - ITC/Deltacom Disagree
ITEM NO. 13 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Part 3 - Expedited Feature Process - Page 35 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 66.6% - APPROVED	Agree - BST Generally Agree - Sprint, Telcordia, Ztel Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree - AT&T, ITC/Deltacom
ITEM NO. 14 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Part 3 - Expedited Feature Process - Page 39 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 83.3% - APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, BST Generally Agree - Ztel Neutral - ITC/Deltacom Somewhat Disagree - Telcordia Disagree - Sprint
ITEM NO. 15 - Meeting Consensus Section 4 - Change Control Process Flow - Types 2-5 Process Flow - Page 31 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Sprint, Generally Agree - Telcordia, Ztel Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree

Docket No. 00-00079

	JMB-S4 Page 4 of 7
ITEM NO. 16 - Meeting Consensus Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 41	Agree - AT&T, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Sprint, Telcordia, Ztel Generally Agree
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 17 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, BST,
Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 44	Generally Agree - Sprint, Telcordia
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Neutral Somewhat Disagree – ztel Disagree
ITEM NO. 49 Mosting Comments	
ITEM NO. 18 – Meeting Consensus Section 5 – Defect Process – Page 44	Agree - AT&T, BST, Sprint, Ztel Generally Agree - Telcordia Neutral - ITC/Deltacom
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 19 - Meeting Consensus	Agree – AT&T, BST, Sprint, Ztel
Section 5 - Defect Process - Page 45	Generally Agree - Telcordia
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Neutral – ITC/Deltacom Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 20 - Meeting Consensus	Agree - AT&T, Ztel
Section 6 – Change Review – Prioritization – Release Package Development and Approval – Page 48	Generally Agree - Sprint, Telcordia Neutral
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS – 66.6% - APPROVED	Somewhat Disagree Disagree - BST, ITC/Deltacom

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S4 Page 5 of 7

	3
ITEM NO. 21 – Meeting Consensus Section 6 – Change Review – Prioritization – Release Package Development and Approval – Page 49 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS – 100% - APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, BST Generally Agree - Sprint, Telcordia, Ztel Neutral - ITC/Deltacom Somewhat Disagree Disagree
INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	
ITEM NO. 22 - Meeting Consensus Section 6 - Change Review - Prioritization - Release Package Development and Approval - Page 49 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Sprint, Telcordia Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree - ztel Disagree
ITEM NO. 23 – Meeting Consensus Section 6 – Change Review – Prioritization – Release Package Development and Approval – Page 51 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS – 50% - DISAPPROVED	Agree - BST, Ztel Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree - Sprint Disagree - AT&T, ITC/Deltacom, Telcordia
ITEM NO. 24 - Meeting Consensus Section 7 - Introduction and Retirement of Interfaces - Page 52 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, BST, Sprint, Ztel Generally Agree - Telcordia Neutral - ITC/Deltacom Somewhat Disagree Disagree

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S4 Page 6 of 7

ITEM NO. 25 - Meeting Consensus Section 7 - Introduction and Retirement of Interfaces - Page 53 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Ztel Generally Agree - Sprint, Telcordia Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 26 - Meeting Consensus Section 8 - Escalation Process - Guidelines - Page 54 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, BST, Ztel Generally Agree - ITC/Deltacom, Sprint, Telcordia Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 27 - Meeting Consensus Section 8 - REMOVE - Contact List for Escalation - Types 2- 6 Changes - Page 58 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, BST, ITC/Deltacom, Sprint, Telcordia, Ztel Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 28 - Meeting Consensus Appendix - Sub-Team Guidelines INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 100% - APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, BST, Telcordia, Ztel Generally Agree - ITC/Deltacom,, Sprint Neutral Somewhat Disagree Disagree
ITEM NO. 29 - Meeting Consensus Section 9 - CHANGES TO THE PROCESS - Page 62 INDUSTRY CONSENSUS - 66.6%- APPROVED	Agree - AT&T, ITC/Deltacom, Ztel Generally Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree - Sprint

	Disagree - BST, Telcordia

Docket No. 00-00079 JMB-S4 Page 7 of 7